

REMARKS

Claims 1-17 and 22-27 stand cancelled without prejudice; claims 18-21 are allowed and new claim 28 has been added. Figure 8 has been amended merely to recite sequence identifiers where appropriate and a suitable replacement sheet is enclosed. No new matter is presented by virtue of the within amendment. For instance, the subject matter of new claim 28 is supported by the present claim 18, former claim 27 and the description set forth in the present application at pages 20-21.

As an initial matter, Applicants appreciate the indication of allowable subject matter, i.e., that claims 18-21 are allowed. Applicants also wish to extend their appreciation to Examiner Devi for her helpful comments during the informal telephonic interview conducted on May 10, 2004. During that interview, further amendments to claim 27 were discussed in an effort to present the subject matter of that claim in a form which would be allowable. While no firm agreement was reached, new claim 28 is presented in lieu of former claim 27 and in view of that discussion.

Referring now to the Office Action, the specification stands objected to for alleged sequence non-compliance. As the objection is understood, issue is taken in that the amino acid sequences recited in Figure 8 are not identified by SEQ ID NO., as required under 37 CFR 1.821-1.825.

Applicants submit herewith an amended Figure 8 which shows each required SEQ ID NO. Thus, withdrawal of the objection is requested.

Claim 27 stands rejected under 35 USC §112, 2nd paragraph, for various informalities and certain aspects allegedly requiring clarification.

It is believed that the within amendments obviate the rejection. For instance, claim 27 has been cancelled and the subject matter thereof is presented in new independent claim 28. Claim 28 recites a competitive immunoassay which seeks to clarify the subject matter of former claim 27. New claim 28 is supported in the present application at pages 20-21, wherein a detailed description of the competitive reaction is provided. Therein, the specification provides clarification as to how the phosphatidylinositol-3,4,5-triphosphate can act both as a binding agent and inhibitory agent. Accordingly, the bound and unbound antibody can both be detected in the same assay. That disclosure together with new claim 28 is believed to obviate the rejection of former claim 27 under 35 USC §112, 2nd paragraph. Thus, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection are requested.

It is believed the application is in condition for immediate allowance, which action is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,



Christine C. O'Day (Reg. 38,256)
EDWARDS & ANGELL, LLP
P.O. Box 55874
Boston, MA 02205
Tel. (617) 439-4444